

09-15-06

AF  
ZWW

Express Mail Label No.: EQ749137065US

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

SEP 14 2006

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

26

Application Number

10/643,597

Filing Date

August 19, 2003

First Named Inventor

Walter H. WHITLOCK

Art Unit

1746

Examiner Name

Zeinab El Arini

Attorney Docket Number

M02A454

**ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)**

Fee Transmittal Form



Fee Attached



Amendment/Reply



After Final



Affidavits/declaration(s)



Extension of Time Request



Express Abandonment Request



Information Disclosure Statement



Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

Reply to Missing Parts/  
Incomplete ApplicationReply to Missing Parts  
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

Drawing(s)



Licensing-related Papers



Petition

Petition to Convert to a  
Provisional Application

Power of Attorney, Revocation



Change of Correspondence Address



Terminal Disclaimer



Request for Refund



CD, Number of CD(s) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Landscape Table on CD

After Allowance Communication to TC

Appeal Communication to Board  
of Appeals and InterferencesAppeal Communication to TC  
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)

Proprietary Information



Status Letter

Other Enclosure(s) (please identify  
below):Reply Brief (25 pages) and  
Return Receipt Postcard

Remarks


It is not believed at this time that any additional fee is due. As a precaution, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 02-2865 any additional fee required by this submission or credit any overpayment.

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name

The BOC Group, Inc.

Signature



Printed name

David A. Hey

Date

September 14, 2006


Reg. No.

32,351

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature



Typed or printed name

Kimberly S. Brown


Date

September 14, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Express Mail Label No.: EQ749137065US



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Of: Walter H. WHITLOCK  
Serial No: 10/643,597  
Art Unit: 1746  
Examiner: El Arini, Zeinab  
For: Process and System for Cleaning Surfaces of Semiconductor Wafers  
BOC Case No: M02A454

Filed: 19 August 2003  
Confirmation No.: 3964

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 14, 2006

REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

The following Reply Brief is respectfully submitted in connection with the above identified application in response to the Examiner's Answer dated 14 July 2006:

withdrawing the rejection of claims 6-7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph;  
maintaining the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. in combination with Nishio as set forth in the Final Office Action dated 12 January 2006;

maintaining the rejection of claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in combination with Nishio as set forth in the Final Office Action dated 12 January 2006;

setting forth a new ground of rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney; and  
setting forth a new ground of rejection of claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney.

This Reply Brief is being submitted as a substitute to the original Appeal Brief and responds to both the new grounds of rejection and all other grounds of rejection covered in the original Appeal Brief.

## Table of Contents

Cover Sheet	Page 1 - 2
Table of Contents	Page 3
Real Party in Interest	Page 4
Related Appeals and Interferences	Page 5
Status of Claims	Page 6
Status of Amendments	Page 7
Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	Page 8 - 10
Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	Page 11
Argument	Page 12 - 20
Claims Appendix	Page 21 - 24
Evidence Appendix	Page 25
Related Proceedings Appendix	Page 26

Case No. M02A454

Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest for the above identified application are the inventors, and the assignee of the invention, The BOC Group, Inc.

Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences known to any of the appellants, the undersigned or the assignee which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are rejected and claims 1-20 are appealed.

#### Status of Amendments

An amendment after-final rejection was filed 30 March 2006 and has been acted upon by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner indicated in the Advisory Action that the amendment would be entered for purposes of appeal but that claims 1-20 remained rejected over prior art. The Examiner also indicated that a rejection based on 35 USC 112, second paragraph had been overcome.

However, the amendment filed 30 March 2006 was also found by the Examiner to be non-compliant because of deficiencies in an earlier amendment to the specification. Therefore, a supplemental amendment was filed 28 April 2006 to overcome the non-compliance. The Examiner responded to this supplemental amendment in the Examiner's Answer indicating that the amendment remained non-compliant as the complete paragraphs including the amendments on pages 4 and 11 were not provided. Because these amendments relate to minor informalities, it is respectfully requested that further action be held in abeyance until determination of the appeal of the rejections of claims in this application.

### Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention relates to processes and systems for cleaning the surface of a semiconductor wafer. In general semiconductor wafers are cleaned using a combination of organic solvents and dense gases, such as isopropyl alcohol mixed with carbon dioxide. These cleaning mixtures must be delivered to the wafer at high pressure (1000 psia or more) because of the need to liquefy the gas component. This requires the use of high-pressure pumps that may have to be constructed of relatively expensive, corrosion-resistant materials. Such pumps are generally suitable for delivery at constant flow rates, but are less adept at delivering momentary or surge flow rates. In addition, if additives are needed, a separate high-pressure pump may be required. (Specification page 1, lines 24-34)

The present invention provides processes and systems for cleaning semiconductor wafers wherein the number of high-pressure pumps is minimized and momentary or surge flow rates can be provided. In particular, independent claim 1 of the present invention provides a process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, wherein a cleaning component selected from the group consisting of a dense gas component, a liquid component and a mixture thereof is provided to a bellows accumulator, and an elevated pressure is applied to the bellows to discharge the cleaning component onto the surface of a wafer to be cleaned. (Specification page 3, lines 19-25)

Claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1 and include further features and limitations of the present invention. In particular, claim 2 requires the dense gas component to be dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide. (Specification page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 7) Claim 3 includes the limitation that the liquid component is an organic liquid soluble or miscible in dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide, while claim 4 sets forth specific liquid components, e.g., isopropyl alcohol. (Specification page 6, lines 18-29) Claim 5 requires the elevated pressure applied to the bellows is via a compressed gas. (Specification page 11, lines 23-25; Fig. 1) Claim 6 and 7 includes limitations covering the headspace pressure for a pressure chamber in which the contacting takes place as well as a velocity at which the cleaning component is sent toward the wafer surface. (Specification page 9, lines 20-28)



Independent claim 8 of the present invention describes another process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, wherein multiple bellows accumulators are utilized, a first for conveying a dense gas component and a second for conveying a liquid component to the wafer surface.

(Specification page 3, line 26-34)

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and require further limitations according to the present invention. In particular, claim 9 requires the elevated pressure applied to the second bellows is via the dense gas component (Specification page 11, lines 23-25; Fig. 1), while claim 10 includes the limitation that the dense gas component and liquid component are mixed prior to application to the wafer surface. (Specification page 11, lines 29-32; Fig. 1)

Independent claim 11 of the present invention defines a further process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, wherein two accumulators are used, a first to convey a dense gas component and a second to convey a liquid component to the wafer. The accumulator for the dense gas is a bellows accumulator and the elevated pressure supplied to the second accumulator is applied via the dense gas component. (Specification page 4, lines 4-13)

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and requires that the dense gas component and liquid component are mixed prior to application to the wafer surface. (Specification page 11, lines 29-32; Fig. 1)

Independent claim 13 of the present invention provides a system for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, including a bellows accumulator adapted to receive and retain a cleaning component selected from a dense gas component, a liquid component and a mixture thereof; means to apply elevated pressure to discharge the cleaning component onto a wafer, and a chamber to receive and retain the wafer during cleaning. (Specification page 4, lines 15-21)

Independent claim 14 of the present invention describes a system for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, having two accumulators, one for each of a dense gas component and a liquid component, wherein the first accumulator is a bellows accumulator, means to apply elevated pressure to each accumulator and a chamber to retain the wafer during cleaning. (Specification page 4, lines 22-31)

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and includes the further limitation of a means adapted to receive and mix the dense gas component and the liquid component prior to the chamber. (Specification page 11, lines 29-32; Fig. 1)

Independent claim 16 of the present invention provides a process of mixing a dense gas component and a liquid component, the process comprising conveying the dense gas component to a bellows accumulator, conveying the liquid component to an accumulator, applying elevated pressure to the bellows accumulator to discharge the dense gas therefrom, applying elevated pressure to the second accumulator to discharge the liquid component therefrom, and combining the discharged dense gas component and the discharged liquid component to form a mixture. (Specification page 4, line 32 – page 5, line 7)

Claims 17 – 20 depend from claim 16 and include further limitations according to the present invention. In particular, claim 17 requires the second accumulator to be a bellows accumulator. (Specification page 7, lines 31-32; Fig. 1) Claim 18 includes the limitation that the dense gas component is dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide. (Specification page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 7) Claim 19 includes the limitation that the liquid component is an organic liquid soluble or miscible in dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide, while claim 20 sets forth specific liquid components, e.g., isopropyl alcohol. (Specification page 6, lines 18-29)

The present invention provides enhanced wafer cleaning performance and has the advantage of delivering dense gas and liquid at high pressures and flow rates without the use of high-pressure pumps.

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed

1. Whether claims 1-20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. (US 2002/0112747) in combination with Nishio (US 6,612,818).
2. Whether claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton (US 6,085,762) in combination with Nishio.
3. Whether claims 1-20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney (US 6,076,557).
4. Whether claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney.

## Argument

1. Whether claims 1-20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. (US 2002/0112747) in combination with Nishio (US 6,612,818).

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. in combination with Nishio. The Examiner cites DeYoung et al. as disclosing a process and apparatus for cleaning semiconductor wafers using dense carbon dioxide. However, the Examiner recognizes that DeYoung et al. does not teach use of a bellows accumulator as defined by the present claims. Therefore, the Examiner relies on Nishio for disclosure of a bellows type pump and accumulator used to transport chemical liquid for various processes, including washing liquid crystal displays. The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious “to use the accumulator taught by Nishio instead of the pressure vessel taught by DeYoung et al. to obtain the claimed process and system, and to improve the cleaning process”. The Examiner reaches this conclusion “because both accumulator and pressure vessel [are] used to elevate the pressure of the cleaning component”. In addition, the Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious “to adjust the flow rate to obtain the component velocity as claimed”, but does not cite any prior art in support thereof. These rejections are respectfully traversed and it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentably distinct from DeYoung et al. in combination with Nishio.

Initially it is respectfully submitted that in order to support a conclusion that a claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teaching of the references. (See Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972; PTO Bd of APP INT, 1985.) Further, applicants respectfully submit that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. (See ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospitals, 221 USPQ 929; Fed Cir. 1984.)

In this light, it is respectfully submitted that DeYoung et al. and Nishio clearly fail to expressly or impliedly suggest combination. Further, the Examiner has failed to provide a convincing line of reasoning that supports the combination. In particular, it is clear that neither DeYoung et al. nor

Nishio expressly or impliedly suggests combination. In fact, the two references are directed to very different technologies that makes the supposed combination extremely unlikely. DeYoung et al. relates to methods of cleaning microelectronic structures, while Nishio is directed to reducing pulsation in a bellows type pump. While the Nishio pump could be used in a surface cleaning system, such fact hardly supports the combination suggested by the Examiner. In particular, the mere fact that both the DeYoung et al. and Nishio systems employ some type of pressure device falls well short of providing the necessary incentive for combination.

Further, even if the references could be combined as suggested by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that such combination would not render the present invention obvious. In this light, the Examiner has recognized that DeYoung et al. fails to teach or suggest the use of a bellows accumulator. It is respectfully submitted that replacing the vessel of DeYoung et al. with the bellows type pump of Nishio would actually render the DeYoung et al. apparatus and method inoperable. The cleaning process of DeYoung et al., as well as that of the present invention, requires elevated pressures for the cleaning components. Conversely, Nishio discloses use of either a bellows type pump or a bellows type accumulator employed as a pulse dampener to convey a low pressure fluid in a chemical process. The bellows type pump of Nishio is incapable of pumping fluids to high pressure for a number of reasons. Initially, excessive force would be required to move the piston rod 13 if high pressures were present in bellows 7 of Nishio. In addition, the bellows 7 is required to be easily deformable and therefore is incapable of containing high pressure without having balancing with high pressure fluids outside of the bellows 7. Clearly, Nishio does not disclose such an arrangement. Therefore, there is simply no incentive for one skilled in the art to look to Nishio, a low pressure system, as a possible combination with DeYoung et al., a high pressure system. As noted, even if combinable, such combination would not render the present invention obvious, but would rather result in an inoperable system.

The Examiner also appears to be asserting that the adjustment of flow rate to obtain component velocity as claimed in the instant claims would be "well known" or a "matter of common knowledge" and that the particular velocities of the present claims (claims 6 and 7) would be "well known". This assertion is respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to meet the "substantial evidence" standard (See MPEP 2144.03) that requires the facts asserted to be well-known be capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. It is not appropriate for

the Examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known, as is the case here. It is clear that the specific velocities of the present claims are not well known, but rather a specific dependent limitation appropriate for the present invention. The Examiner had been asked repeatedly to provide documentary evidence supporting this allegation as required by MPEP 2144.03, but has failed to do so, despite adding the new grounds of rejection as will be discussed in more detail below.

It is further noted that many specific limitations of the present claims have been completely ignored by the Examiner. In particular, as noted above with respect to present claims 6 and 7, neither DeYoung et al. nor Nishio provide any guidance on the velocity at which cleaning mixtures are imparted to the wafer surface. Further, all of present claims 8-12 and 14-20 require the presence and use of two accumulators, preferably two bellows accumulators. Such an arrangement is not contemplated or even hinted at by either DeYoung et al. or Nishio. In this light, it is abundantly clear that there is no reasonable combination of these references that would result in the claimed invention having two accumulators. Such a result can only be attributed to impermissible hindsight in light of the instant invention. In addition, since the use of two accumulators is not suggested by any combination of DeYoung et al. and Nishio, there can simply be no obviousness attached to the interrelated workings of the two accumulators as set forth in the present claims: e.g., applying the elevated pressure to the second bellows via the dense gas component (claims 9, 11 for example); mixing the components from the two accumulators prior to entering the process chamber (claims 10, 12, 15, 16 for example).

It is respectfully submitted that present claims 1-20 are patentably distinct from DeYoung et al. in combination with Nishio and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of such claims under 35 USC 103(a) be reviewed and overturned by the Board of Appeals.

2. Whether claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton (US 6,085,762) in combination with Nishio.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in combination with Nishio. The Examiner indicates that Barton discloses a process and

system for cleaning semiconductor wafers, but notes that Barton (like DeYoung et al.) fails to teach the bellows accumulator required by the present claims. Therefore, the Examiner again relies on Nishio for teaching a bellows accumulator for the same reasons as set forth with respect to claims 1-20 and the combination with DeYoung et al. noted above. These rejections are traversed and it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentably distinct from Barton in combination with Nishio.

The Barton system uses three ballast tanks 36, 38, and 40 that are simple vessels periodically refilled with the dense phase fluid and fluid modifier. Such simple vessels are sufficient in Barton because there is no capability to maintain constant pressure in the process vessel of Barton. In fact, it is actually intended to be able to change the pressure in the process vessel. As noted above, Nishio relates to a low pressure system. There is again no reason why one skilled in the art would look to Nishio for combination with Barton, and clearly the Examiner has failed to meet the burden necessary for establishing such a combination. The Examiner's statements that "simply alternating choice of tank because Barton discloses that to render the process as continuously efficient as possible ..." falls well short of this burden and in fact makes little if any sense. It is completely unclear why or how the bellows pump of Nishio could be substituted for the ballast tanks of Barton and it is respectfully submitted that such substitution would at best defeat the purpose of the Barton system.

As noted above with respect to the combination of DeYoung et al. and Nishio, many specific limitations of the present claims have again been completely ignored by the Examiner. In particular, all of present claims 8-12 and 14-20 require the presence and use of two accumulators, preferably two bellows accumulators. Such an arrangement is not contemplated or even hinted at by either Barton or Nishio and therefore is the construct of impermissible hindsight on the part of the Examiner. In addition, since the use of two accumulators is not suggested by any combination of Barton and Nishio, there can simply be no obviousness attached to the interrelated workings of the two accumulators as set forth in the present claims: e.g., applying the elevated pressure to the second bellows via the dense gas component (claims 9, 11 for example); mixing the components from the two accumulators prior to entering the process chamber (claims 10, 12, 15, 16 for example).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that present claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are patentably distinct from Barton in combination with Nishio and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of such claims under 35 USC 103(a) be reconsidered by the Board of Appeals and overturned.

3. Whether claims 1-20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeYoung et al. in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney (US 6,076,557).

This new ground of rejection was added for the first time in the Examiner's Answer of July 14, 2006. The statement of rejection is a nearly identical to the statement of rejection noted above with respect to DeYoung et al. and Nishio alone. However, the Examiner has noted specific statements in Nishio that suggest the Nishio accumulator can be used at "elevated pressure". Further, the Examiner now relies upon Carney as evidence that diaphragm type accumulators are typically suited only for relatively low pressure applications when constructed of metal and somewhat higher pressure applications when constructed of rubber. The Examiner then reaches the same conclusion as before stating that "it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to use the accumulator taught by Nishio instead of the pressure vessel taught by DeYoung et al. to obtain the claimed process and system, and to improve the cleaning process". These rejections are respectfully traversed and it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentably distinct from DeYoung et al. in view of Nishio as further evidenced by Carney.

Nothing in the newest statements of the Examiner concerning Nishio, nor the addition of the Carney reference alters the arguments set forth above in any way. Rather, there is even less reason for the combination suggested by the Examiner. In particular, the none of DeYoung et al., Nishio no Carney expressly or impliedly suggest any combination and the Examiner has completely failed to provide any line of reasoning, much less a convincing line of reasoning to support the suggested combination. The references to Nishio that state that filling pressure can be raised and the utilization of an "automatic air supply valve mechanism" does not alter the fact that Nishio is exclusively for use in low pressure situations. It is noted that even the Examiner does not suggest that Nishio can be used for high pressure operations, but rather relies on the use of the term "elevated". Clearly, elevated and high pressure are not the same thing. Further, whether different types of materials used for different bellows would allow operation at different pressures as suggested by Carney, does not provide any impetus for the combination of DeYoung et al. an Nishio as suggested by the Examiner. Rather, the



addition of a third reference simply makes the suggested combination even less likely and more the product of impermissible hindsight.

For the reasons noted above, even if DeYoung and Nishio could be combined as suggested by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that such combination would not render the present invention obvious and would actually render the DeYoung et al. apparatus and method inoperable. Carney adds nothing to this combination that would alter the inoperability of the DeYoung and Nishio combination. There is simply no incentive for one skilled in the art to look to Carney to solve problems with the combination of Nishio with DeYoung et al.

Further, the Examiner has still failed to provide any documentary evidence to support the allegations that the adjustment of flow rate to obtain component velocity as claimed in the instant claims would be "well known" or a "matter of common knowledge" and that the particular velocities of the present claims (claims 6 and 7) would be "well known". It does not appear that Carney was cited for such purpose and there is nothing in Carney would suggest such a conclusion. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to meet the "substantial evidence" standard (See MPEP 2144.03) that requires the facts asserted to be well-known be capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.

In light of the above, it is clear that the Examiner has completely ignored the many specific limitations of the present claims. With respect to present claims 6 and 7, none of DeYoung et al., Nishio nor Carney provide any guidance on the velocity at which cleaning mixtures are imparted to the wafer surface. Further, all of present claims 8-12 and 14-20 require the presence and use of two accumulators, preferably two bellows accumulators. Such an arrangement is not contemplated or even hinted at by any of DeYoung et al., Nishio or Carney. In this light, it is abundantly clear that there is no reasonable combination of these references that would result in the claimed invention having two accumulators and that such a result can only be attributed to impermissible hindsight in light of the instant invention. In addition, since the use of two accumulators is not suggested by any combination of DeYoung et al., Nishio and Carney, there can simply be no obviousness attached to the interrelated workings of the two accumulators as set forth in the present claims: e.g., applying the elevated pressure to the second bellows via the dense gas component (claims 9, 11 for example); mixing the components from the two accumulators prior to entering the process chamber (claims 10, 12, 15, 16 for example).

It is respectfully submitted that present claims 1-20 are patentably distinct from DeYoung et al. in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of such claims under 35 USC 103(a) be reviewed and overturned by the Board of Appeals.

4. Whether claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney.

This new ground of rejection was also added for the first time in the Examiner's Answer of July 14, 2006. The Carney reference has been added to the rejection for the same reasons as noted above; e.g., as evidence that diaphragm type accumulators are typically suited only for relatively low pressure applications when constructed of metal and somewhat higher pressure applications when constructed of rubber. The Examiner continues to reach the same conclusions that "it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to use the accumulator taught by Nishio instead of the ballast tank taught by Barton to obtain the claimed process and system, and to improve the cleaning process". These rejections are respectfully traversed and it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentably distinct from Barton in view of Nishio as further evidenced by Carney.

There is very little to add here by way of argument as the Examiner has so clearly failed to provide any plausible reasoning for the suggested combination or how such combination would meet the requirements of the present claims. The addition of the Carney reference does nothing to alter the arguments set forth above in any way. Rather, there is even less reason for the combination suggested by the Examiner. In particular, the none of Barton, Nishio no Carney expressly or impliedly suggest any combination and the Examiner has completely failed to provide any line of reasoning, much less a convincing line of reasoning to support the suggested combination. Rather, the addition of a third reference simply makes the suggested combination even less likely and more the product of impermissible hindsight. It remains completely unclear why or how the bellows pump of Nishio could be substituted for the ballast tanks of Barton and it is respectfully submitted that such substitution would at best defeat the purpose of the Barton system, irregardless of the teachings of Carney.

As noted above, the Examiner has completely ignored the many specific limitations of the present claims. None of Barton, Nishio nor Carney provide any guidance related to the use of two accumulators, preferably two bellows accumulators. Such an arrangement is not contemplated or even hinted at by any of Barton, Nishio or Carney. In this light, it is abundantly clear that there is no reasonable combination of these references that would result in the claimed invention having two accumulators and that such a result can only be attributed to impermissible hindsight in light of the instant invention. In addition, since the use of two accumulators is not suggested by any combination of Barton, Nishio and Carney, there can simply be no obviousness attached to the interrelated workings of the two accumulators as set forth in the present claims: e.g., applying the elevated pressure to the second bellows via the dense gas component (claims 9, 11 for example); mixing the components from the two accumulators prior to entering the process chamber (claims 10, 12, 15, 16 for example).

It is respectfully submitted that present claims 1-2, 5, 8-19 and 20 are patentably distinct from Barton in view of Nishio and as further evidenced by Carney and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of such claims under 35 USC 103(a) be reviewed and overturned by the Board of Appeals.

#### Response to Argument

The Examiner has provided further reasoning in the Reply Brief in response to arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief. In particular, The Examiner suggests that the argument that Nishio does not disclose applying elevated pressure to the bellow is unpersuasive. The Examiner further suggests the Nishio accumulator is capable of use in high pressure, because "Nishio indicates that compressed air is used to elevate the pressures in the bellows and thus suggest that bellows accumulators can be used at elevated/higher pressure". The Examiner then repeats the discussion relating to Carney and concludes that one skilled in the art would find the Nishio accumulator to be capable and readily useful in high pressure systems and applications. Moreover, the Examiner finds that one skilled in the art would find it obvious to adjust the pressure in Nishio by using a pressure-regulating mechanism because the pressure claimed could read on pressurizing the bellow to discharge the liquid toward the surface to be treated and because the references are all from the same technical endeavor, i.e., using densified carbon dioxide cleaning compositions for cleaning a substrate under pressure.

The above remarks of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Initially, it is noted that the Examiner has mischaracterized the applicants' arguments. In particular, applicants have never argued that Nishio is incapable of operating at "elevated" pressure, but rather that Nishio represents a low pressure system as opposed to the "high" pressure system of DeYoung et al. As noted above, there is a significant difference between elevating pressure and high pressure. The fact that Nishio needs to elevate pressure in the bellows for operation does not alter the fact that Nishio is solely a low pressure apparatus and can not possibly be used as a substitute for high pressure portions of DeYoung et al. or Barton. Carney adds nothing to the Examiner's arguments concerning this point.

The additional comments concerning the ability to adjust pressure in Nishio by using a pressure-regulating mechanism are not understood as such has little if anything to do with the present invention as claimed. Further, the Examiners statements that the references are all from the same technical endeavor are respectfully traversed. At least with respect to Carney, there does not appear to be any evidence supporting the Examiner's statements.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons noted above, appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-20 is not properly founded in law and, therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Board of Appeals so find and reverse the Examiner's final rejection.

A copy of the Claims on appeal, i.e., Claims 1-20 is found in the attached appendix. To the extent necessary, Appellants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 by separate letter.

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Hey  
Senior Counsel  
Registration Number 32,351  
Correspondence Customer Number 20411

Case No. M02A454

## CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, which comprises:  
providing a wafer;  
conveying a component selected from the group consisting of: a dense gas component, a liquid component and a mixture thereof to a bellows accumulator having a bellows therein;  
applying an elevated pressure to said bellows sufficient to discharge said component from said bellows onto said surface of said wafer; and  
contacting said component with said surface of said wafer to clean said wafer.
2. The process of claim 1, wherein said dense gas component is dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide.
3. The process of claim 2, wherein said liquid component is an organic liquid component soluble or miscible in dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide.
4. The process of claim 1, wherein said liquid component is selected from the group consisting of: isopropyl alcohol, hydrofluoric acid, pyridine and combinations thereof.
5. The process of claim 1, wherein said elevated pressure is applied to said bellows via a compressed gas.
6. The process of claim 1, wherein said component is a mixture and said step of contacting said component with said surface of said semiconductor wafer takes place in a pressure chamber, and further comprising the steps of:  
charging said pressure chamber with said mixture to a free headspace pressure of about 1000 psia or more, and  
discharging said mixture from said bellows at a flow rate sufficient to impart a mixture velocity of about 10 cm/sec or more.
7. The process of claim 1, wherein said component is a mixture and said step of contacting said component with said surface of said semiconductor wafer takes place in a pressure chamber, and further comprising the steps of:

charging said pressure chamber with said mixture to a free headspace pressure of about 2400 psia or more, and

discharging said mixture from said bellows at a flow rate sufficient to impart a mixture velocity next to the wafer surface of about 50 cm/sec or more.

8. A process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, which comprises:  
providing a wafer;  
conveying a dense gas component to a first bellows accumulator having a first bellows therein;  
conveying a liquid component to a second bellows accumulator having a second bellows therein;  
applying an elevated pressure to said first bellows sufficient to discharge said dense gas component from said first bellows onto a surface of said wafer;  
applying an elevated pressure to said second bellows sufficient to discharge said liquid component from said second bellows onto said surface of said wafer; and  
contacting said dense gas component or said liquid component with said surface of said wafer to clean said wafer.

9. The process of claim 8, wherein said elevated pressure is applied to said second bellows via said dense gas component.

10. The process of claim 8, wherein said dense gas component and said liquid component are mixed prior to application to said surface of said wafer.

11. A process for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, which comprises:  
providing a wafer;  
conveying a dense gas component to a first accumulator wherein said first accumulator is a bellows accumulator having a first bellows therein;  
conveying a liquid component to a second accumulator;  
applying an elevated pressure to said first bellows sufficient to discharge said dense gas component from said first bellows onto said surface of said wafer;

applying an elevated pressure via said dense gas component to said second accumulator sufficient to discharge said liquid component from said second accumulator onto said surface of said wafer; and

contacting said dense gas component and said liquid component with said surface of said wafer to clean said wafer.

12. The process of claim 11, wherein said dense gas component and said liquid component are mixed prior to application to said surface of said wafer.

13. A system for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, which comprises:

a bellows accumulator having a bellows therein adapted to receive and retain a component selected from the group consisting of a dense gas component, a liquid component and a mixture thereof;

a means for applying an elevated pressure to said component sufficient to discharge it from said bellows onto a wafer;

a chamber adapted to receive and retain said semiconductor wafer and receive said component.

14. A system for cleaning a surface of a semiconductor wafer, which comprises:

a first accumulator wherein said first accumulator is a bellows accumulator having a bellows therein adapted to receive and retain a dense gas component;

a means for applying an elevated pressure to said dense gas component sufficient to discharge it from said bellows onto a wafer;

a second accumulator adapted to receive and retain a liquid component;

a means for applying an elevated pressure to said liquid component sufficient to discharge it from the second accumulator onto said wafer;

a chamber adapted to receive and retain said semiconductor wafer and receive said dense gas component and said liquid component.

15. The system of claim 14, further comprising a means adapted to receive and mix said dense gas component and said liquid component prior to said chamber.

16. A process for mixing a dense gas component and a liquid component, which comprises:  
conveying a dense gas component to a first accumulator wherein said first accumulator is a bellows accumulator having a first bellows therein;  
conveying a liquid component to a second accumulator;  
applying an elevated pressure to said first bellows sufficient to discharge said dense gas component from said first bellows;  
applying an elevated pressure to said second accumulator sufficient to discharge said liquid component from said second accumulator; and  
combining the discharged dense gas component and the discharged liquid component to form a mixture.
17. The process of claim 16, wherein the second accumulator is a second bellows accumulator.
18. The process of claim 16, wherein said dense gas component is dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide.
19. The process of claim 16, wherein said liquid component is an organic liquid component soluble or miscible in dense carbon dioxide or supercritical carbon dioxide.
20. The process according to claim 16, wherein said liquid component is selected from the group consisting of: isopropyl alcohol, hydrofluoric acid, pyridine and combinations thereof.



## EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Not Applicable

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Not Applicable